REMARKS

Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 8, 10 through 14, 17 through 20 and 22 through 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,385,591 B1 (Mankoff). Examiner has rejected claims 15, 16, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankoff in view of USPN 6,085,110 A (Nilsson). Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankoff in view of USPN 6,496,857 B1 (Dustin). Applicant has amended the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as to the claims as amended.

In the discussion below, Applicant points out subject matter in each of the independent claims that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. On the basis of this, Applicant believes all the claims are patentable over Mankoff, Nilsson, Dustin and any combination thereof.

Discussion of Independent Claims 1 and 17

Claim 1 sets out a method for content clipping. Claim 17 sets out storage media. In step (b) of claims 1 and 17, upon the user selecting content displayed within a network document to be clipped, a bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored within a database, and a network address for the network document is stored along with the bit-mapped image of the selected content. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner.

Examiner has cited Mankoff as disclosing the subject matter of claims 1 and 17. In Mankoff, a server 25 has a database 27 that contains virtual coupons 40. Each coupon is a data file of information stored in database 27. See Mankoff at column 3, lines 50 through 62. A web page displays a banner advertisement for a coupon. See column 4, lines 5 through 9. When a user clicks on the banner, the client's browser is redirected to the server 25 which sends a virtual coupon (i.e., the data file of information stored in database 27) to a user. See Mankoff at column 4, lines 8 through 11. The file information may include contact information associated with the coupon provider. This information can include a web site URL for the coupon provider. See Mankoff at column 1, lines 55 through 58.

Mankoff does not disclose or suggest the subject matter disclosed in claims 1 and 17 of the present case. For example, in claims 1 and 17, a bit mapped image of the selected content (originally displayed within a network document) is stored. In Mankoff, this information is not stored. Rather, a file, located on a separate server is downloaded. See Mankoff at column 4, lines 8 through 11. In claims 1 and 17, a network address for the network document is stored along with the bit-mapped image of the selected content. In Mankoff this information is not stored. Rather, as pointed out by Examiner, the coupon file can include a web site URL for the coupon provider. See Mankoff at column 1, lines 55 through 58. However, this is a separate pointer to a company website and is not a network address for the original network document. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest storing a network address for the network document that originally displayed the selected content. Table 1 below summarizes some of the key differences between the subject matter set out in claims 1 and 17 and Mankoff.

<u>Table 1</u>

| | Claim 1 | Mankoff |
|---|---|---|
| Result of selecting content displayed within a network document | A bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored | A separate server is accessed to obtain a file associated with an advertisement |
| | A network address for the <i>network document</i> is stored | A URL to a website for the coupon provider may be included in the file obtained from the separate server. |

As can be seen from Table 1, Mankoff is performing actions unrelated to the subject matter of claims 1 and 17. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest storing a bit-mapped image of selected content originally displayed in a network document and Mankoff does not disclose or suggest storing a network address for the network document along with the bit-mapped image of the selected content.

Discussion of Independent Claims 4 and 18

Claim 4 sets out a method for content clipping. Claim 18 sets out storage media. In step (b) of claims 4 and 18, upon a user selecting the selection tool, a currently displayed network document is parsed for clickable images and a new window is displayed in which any found clickable images are indicated. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner.

Examiner has cited Mankoff as disclosing the subject matter of claims 4 and 18. Examiner has asserted that inherent in displaying a web site, the page must be parsed and an indication must be made of items, such as links, which are clickable.

There are notable differences between the subject matter set out in claims 4 and 18 and the subject matter disclosed by Mankoff. For example, in substep (b.1) of claims 4 and 18, a currently displayed network document is parsed for clickable images. In Mankoff, any parsing that might be done would be performed before the web site is displayed. In substep (b.2) of claims 4 and 18, a new window is displayed that indicates the found clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest any such new window, but only the original web site is displayed. In substep (b.3) of claims 4 and 18, upon a user selecting one of the clickable images, a bit-mapped image of the selected clickable image is stored for later access by the user. In Mankoff, this information is not stored. Rather, a file, located on a separate server is downloaded. See Mankoff at column 4, lines 8 through 11.

Table 2 below summarizes some of the key differences between the subject matter set out in claims 4 and 8 and Mankoff.

<u>Table 2</u>

| | Claims 4 and 18 | Mankoff |
|---|---|--|
| When Clickable Images parsed | A currently displayed network document is parsed for clickable images. | A web sight might be parsed before display of web site (not disclosed, maybe inherent). |
| Where clickable images indicated/displayed | A new window is displayed that indicates the found clickable images | The clickable images are displayed as part of the web site. |
| Result of selecting a clickable image | A bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored | A separate server is accessed to obtain a file associated with an advertisement |

As can be seen from Table 2, Mankoff is performing actions unrelated to the subject matter of claims 4 and 18. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest a currently displayed network document is parsed for clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest displaying a new window that indicates the found clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest a bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored when a clickable image is selected.

Discussion of Independent Claims 10 and 22

Claim 10 sets out a method for content clipping. Claim 22 sets out storage media. In step (a) of claims 10 and 22, upon a user selecting content within a network document to be clipped, the content is parsed for clickable images and any found clickable images are indicated. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner. Examiner has cited Mankoff as disclosing the subject matter of claims 10 and 22. Examiner has asserted that inherent in displaying a web site, the page must be parsed and an indication must be made of items, such as links, which are clickable.

There are notable differences between the subject matter set out in claims 10 and 22 and the subject matter disclosed by Mankoff. For example, in substep (a.1) of claims 10 and 22, selected content from a network document is parsed for clickable images. In Mankoff, any parsing that might be done would be performed of an entire web site before the web site is displayed. In substep (a.2) of claims 10 and 22, a new window is displayed that indicates the found clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest any limited indication of clickable images, but only that all clickable images on an original web site are displayed. In substep (a.3) of claims 10 and 22, upon a user selecting one of the clickable images, a bit-mapped image of the selected clickable image is stored for later access by the user. In Mankoff, this information is not stored. Rather, a file, located on a separate server is downloaded. See Mankoff at column 4, lines 8 through 11.

Table 3 below summarizes some of the key differences between the subject matter set out in claims 10 and 22 and Mankoff.

<u>Table 3</u>

· •

| | Claims 10 and 22 | Mankoff |
|---|---|--|
| When Clickable Images parsed | Selected content from network document is parsed for clickable images. | An entire web page might be parsed before display of web page (not disclosed, maybe inherent). |
| Where clickable images indicated/displayed | The clickable images found within the content are indicated | All clickable images are displayed as part of the web site. |
| Result of selecting a clickable image | A bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored | A separate server is accessed to obtain a file associated with an advertisement |

As can be seen from Table 3, Mankoff is performing actions unrelated to the subject matter of claims 10 and 22. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest selected content from network document is parsed for clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest indicating any clickable images found within the content. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest a bit-mapped image of the selected content is stored when a clickable image is selected.

Discussion of Independent Claims 15 and 24

Claim 15 sets out a method for content clipping. Claims 24 sets out storage media. In step (a) of claims 15 and 24, upon a user selecting content within a network document to be clipped, the content is parsed for clickable images. If only one clickable image is found, a bit-mapped image of the selected clickable image is stored for later access by the user. This is not disclosed or suggested by the art cited by Examiner.

Examiner has cited Mankoff and Nilsson as disclosing the subject matter of claims 15 and 24. Examiner has asserted that inherent in displaying a web site, the page must be parsed and an indication must be made of items, such as links, which are clickable. Examiner has cited Nilsson where Nilsson sets out automatic selection of an arrangement when there is only one arrangement found.

Neither Mankoff nor Nilsson disclose or suggest the subject matter disclosed in claims 15 and 24 of the present case. For example, in step (a) of claims 15 and 24, upon a user selecting content within a network document to be clipped, the content is parsed for clickable images. This is not disclosed or suggested in Mankoff nor Nilsson. Further, in substep (a.2.1) of claim 1, a bitmapped image of the found clickable image is stored for later access.

Table 4 below summarizes some of the key differences between the subject matter set out in claims 15 and 24 and Mankoff.

<u>Table 4</u>

| | Claims 15 and 24 | Mankoff & Nilsson |
|--|---|--|
| When Clickable Images parsed | Selected content from network document is parsed for clickable images. | In Mankoff: An entire web page might be parsed before display of web page (not disclosed, maybe inherent). |
| Result when only one clickable image is found | A bit-mapped image of the clickable image is <i>stored</i> | In Mankoff: Any clickable image is <i>displayed</i> as part of a web page display. In Nilsson: automatic selection within a telecommunication network is disclosed. |

As can be seen from Table 4, Mankoff is performing actions unrelated to the subject matter of claims 15 and 24. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest selected content from network document is parsed for clickable images. Mankoff does not disclose or suggest storing a bitmap image of a clickable image, when one clickable image is found.

Applicant notes that Nilsson only discloses making selections within a telecommunication network. It is not believed that Nilsson discloses subject matter pertinent to the pertinent subject matter set out in claims 15 and 24 such as parsing selected content within a network document and storing a bit-mapped image of a clickable image.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this Amendment has placed the present case in

condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK R. NEWSOME

By Dough & Welle

Douglas L/Weller Reg. No. 30,506

January 12, 2005 Santa Clara, California (408).985-0642